UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,287	02/28/2002	David Wigley	PIZY-002	2035

7590 03/29/2006	EXAMINER
DAVID B. RITCHIE	POPHAM, JEFFREY D

DAVID B. RITCHIE
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP
P.O. BOX 640640
SAN JOSE, CA 95164-0640

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/086,287	WIGLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey D. Popham	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 January 2006_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-29_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-29_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _10 January 2006_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Remarks

Claims 1-29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 1/10/2006, with respect to the

rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are

persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further

consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made with Shannon (U.S. Patent

6,233,618) in view of Pistoia (Pistoia, Marco, "Web Caching and Filtering with IBM

WebSphere Performance Pack", 3/1999, pp. 1-28, obtained from

http://www.redbooks.ibm.com/redpapers/pdfs/redp0009.pdf), Maurer (Maurer et al.,

"Hash Table Methods", 1975, pp. 5-19, obtained from

http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=356645&coll=GUIDE&dl=GUIDE&CFID=52013892

&CFTOKEN=24807428&ret=1#Fulltext), and Willens (U.S. Patent 5,889,958).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims ... are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Shannon (U.S. Patent 6,233,618) in view of Pistoia (Pistoia, Marco, "Web Caching and

Filtering with IBM WebSphere Performance Pack", 3/1999, pp. 1-28, obtained from

http://www.redbooks.ibm.com/redpapers/pdfs/redp0009.pdf).

Regarding Claim 1,

Shannon discloses a method for restricting access to network

accessible digital information by network users of at least one subscriber

network, the method comprising the steps of:

Monitoring at each subscriber network all requests by the network

users for digital information (Column 12, lines 37-52);

Determining whether a location indicator associated with each

request is included in a database of restricted location indicators

maintained at each subscriber network and denying the request where the

location indicator is in the database (Column 14, lines 16-41);

Retrieving the digital information stored at the location indicator and

initially analyzing the content of the information for a predetermined

maximum time in the event that the location indicator is not in the

database and denying or fulfilling the request based on the initial analysis

(Column 14, line 49 to Column 15, line 4);

Retrieving the digital information stored at new locations at a

remote network node and further analyzing the content of the information

(Column 9, line 62 to Column 10, line 6); and

Periodically forwarding the location indicators found to have

restricted content from the remote network node to the subscriber

networks for inclusion in the database of restricted location indicators

(Column 9, lines 25-43);

But does not disclose periodically forwarding the location indicators

not in the database from the subscriber networks to a remote node.

Pistoia, however, discloses periodically forwarding the location

indicators not in the database from the subscriber networks to a remote

node, retrieving the digital information stored at the forwarded location

indicators at the remote network node and further analyzing the content of

the information, and periodically forwarding the location indicators found to

have restricted content from the remote network node to the subscriber

networks for inclusion in the database of restricted location indicators

(Pages 16-18, PICS Filtering at the Proxy Server Level). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's

invention to incorporate the caching/filtering proxy of Pistoia into the

content filtering and access control system of Shannon in order to handle

the situation where the proxy receives a request for a new location that is

not in it's database in a dynamic and efficient manner, in order to allow the

third party to gain knowledge of the new location faster than it would be

able to find this location using it's own methods of walking/crawling the

web, or in order to allow for a hierarchical filtering model, wherein the

client or a downstream proxy could filter more content than an upstream

proxy, as desired by the user or admin, thus providing increased flexibility within the system.

Regarding Claim 11,

Claim 11 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 21,

Claim 21 is a computer software product claim that corresponds to method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 2,

Shannon as modified by Pistoia discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the digital information includes content accessible via the Internet (Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 12,

Claim 12 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 22,

Claim 22 is a computer software product claim that corresponds to method claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 3,

Shannon as modified by Pistoia discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the subscriber networks are LANs

wherein client computers communicate via the Ethernet access protocol
(Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 13,

Claim 13 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 3 and
is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 23,

Claim 23 is a computer software product claim that corresponds to
method claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 4,

Shannon as modified by Pistoia discloses the method of claim 3, in
addition, Shannon discloses that searching of the database and the initial
content analysis occur at an Ethernet bridge installed at the subscriber
network (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3).

Regarding Claim 14,

Claim 14 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 4 and
is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 5,

Shannon as modified by Pistoia discloses the method of claim 1, in
addition, Shannon discloses that the location indicator is a URL (Column
8, lines 24-34).

Regarding Claim 15,

Claim 15 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 5 and

is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 24,

Claim 24 is a computer software product claim that corresponds to

method claim 5 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 6,

Shannon as modified by Pistoia discloses the method of claim 4, in

addition, Shannon discloses that the location indicator is extracted from an

Ethernet frame originating from a client computer of a network user

(Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3).

Regarding Claim 16,

Claim 16 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 6 and

is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 25,

Claim 25 is a computer software product claim that corresponds to

method claim 6 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 8,

Shannon as modified by Pistoia discloses the method of claim 1, in

addition, Shannon discloses the step of determining whether the location

indicator is in an exception list before determining whether it is in the

database and fulfilling the request in the event that the location indicator is

in the exception list (Column 14, line 52 to Column 15, line 15).

Regarding Claim 18,

 Claim 18 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 27,

 Claim 27 is a computer software product claim that corresponds to method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 9,

 Shannon as modified by Pistoia discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the request is fulfilled in the event that the location indicator is in the database but is a permitted category of restricted content (Column 14, lines 16-25).

Regarding Claim 19,

 Claim 19 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 9 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 28,

 Claim 28 is a computer software product claim that corresponds to method claim 9 and is rejected for the same reasons.

3. Claims 7, 17, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon in view of Pistoia, further in view of Maurer (Maurer et al., "Hash Table Methods", 1975, pp. 5-19, obtained from

http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=356645&coll=GUIDE&dl=GUIDE&CFID=52013892

&CFTOKEN=24807428&ret=1#Fulltext).

Regarding Claim 7,

Shannon as modified by Pistoia does not disclose that the

database is stored in encrypted form and is searched for an encrypted

location indicator.

Maurer, however, discloses that the database is stored in encrypted

form and is searched for an encrypted location indicator (Pages 5-7,

Introduction). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hash table of Maurer

into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as

modified by Pistoia in order to provide a faster method of storing and

searching for a specified URL within an organized database of hashes.

Regarding Claim 17,

Claim 17 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 7 and

is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 26,

Claim 26 is a computer software product claim that corresponds to

method claim 7 and is rejected for the same reasons.

4.   Claims 10, 20, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Shannon in view of Pistoia, further in view of Willens (U.S. Patent

5,889,958).

Regarding Claim 10,

Shannon as modified by Pistoia does not disclose that forwarding

and updates to the databases are performed on at least an hourly basis.

Willens, however, discloses that forwarding and updates to the

databases are performed on at least an hourly basis (Column 4, lines 26-

45; and Column 5, lines 38-46). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate

the remote access control system of Willens into the content filtering and

access control system of Shannon as modified by Pistoia in order to allow

the system to be run on a client that does not have a hard drive (dedicated

Internet terminal).

Regarding Claim 20,

Claim 20 is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 10

and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 29,

Claim 29 is a computer software product that corresponds to

method claim 10 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2137

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER